

REMARKS

In the subject Office Action, the examiner rejected Claims 1-5 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Bradley et al. Applicants request reconsideration of their application in view of this response which amends Claims 1 and 3, and provides argument supporting allowance of the pending claims.

Claims 1 and 3 have been amended to more clearly distinguish over Bradley et al. The amended claim language is fully supported by Applicants' specification (see paragraph starting on page 2, line 15) and therefore does contain new matter.

Amended Claim 1 specifies that the mirrored shaft is linearly displaceable along an axis of the shaft for presenting different views to the imaging device, and that the electric motor produces linear displacement of the mirrored shaft along the axis to change the view presented to the imaging device. Applicants consider this language to be equivalent in intent to the original claim language, but believe that it more clearly distinguishes over Bradley et al., which shows a mirror on a shaft that is rotationally (not linearly) displaced to change a view presented to an imaging device. In other words, Applicants' claimed arrangement is the very opposite of Bradley's.

For the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection under 35 USC 102(b) is in error, and request that the rejection be withdrawn. Claims 2-5 depend directly or indirectly from Claim 1, and are patentable over Bradley et al. at least by virtue of such dependency. Therefore, Claims 1-5 are in condition for allowance, and such allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Mark A. Navarre", written in a cursive style.

Mark A. Navarre, Attorney
Registration No. 29572
Telephone: (937) 653-3501